



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

served as his secretary, returned to Scotland and disappeared from view. With Dinwiddie he had some disputes and entertained unjust suspicions of his motives ; but with Stanwix and Bouquet his intercourse was proper, as it was with the man who was to suffer so in his opposition, Thomas Gage. In Virginia he naturally had many correspondents, like Robinson, the Speaker of the Burgesses, William Fairfax, Richard Bland and Dr. Craik, the last of whom was a lifelong friend. The letters from his under officers, like those of Bullitt, Stewart and Peachey, are naturally taken up largely with matters of detail and discipline.

Mr. Hamilton's treatment of these letters still calls for some criticism, though no little improvement in accuracy over the first volume is shown. To know the full relations of this correspondence the editor must at least be familiar with the colonial history and geography of Virginia. Otherwise, it is the blind leading the blind. He repeats an error committed in Vol. I., and gives an impossible spelling, *Conogockuk*, on p. 325 ; *Thurston* is given no less than three times on two pages (290, 292), where *Thruston*, a well-known name, should occur ; he retains the *ff* in a proper name, although the double letter was the conventional sign of a capital ; and he prints no less than five letters from Bosomworth as coming from *Botomworth*. These are but examples of easily avoidable errors, and must be charged to the account of the editor. Mr. Hamilton's insistence in defending certain palpable misreadings in the former volume induces caution in calling attention to similar slips in this volume. But it would seem as though *scene* is printed for *service* on p. 139 ; *Walker* for *Waller*, on p. 373 ; *cilitations* for *cilications* or *cilisitations* on p. 57 ; and *mederes* for *medals*, on p. 80. Again I give only examples. Comment could be made on the omission to supply the missing parts of the Dinwiddie letters (see note on p. 43), and on the bad appearance of pages where the oddities of the writer of the letter are sought to be reproduced in formal type.

WORTHINGTON CHAUNCEY FORD.

*A History of Quaker Government in Pennsylvania.* By ISAAC SHARPLESS, President of Haverford College. Vol. II., The Quakers in the Revolution. (Philadelphia : T. S. Leach and Co. 1899. Pp. vi, 156).

THIS is the second and concluding volume in President Sharpless's study, the *History of Quaker Government in Pennsylvania*. In the former volume he dealt with the colonial period down to 1756, when the Friends surrendered their control of the Assembly ; in the present one he pursues the subject forward to the Revolutionary cataclysm, and adds a chapter describing the protests of the Pennsylvania Friends against slavery, in the period immediately after the Revolution.

If we were inclined to be critical, it might be said that the general title which is given to this work is a misnomer as to events after 1756— all those, indeed, included in the present volume. The Friends did not

“govern” Pennsylvania in any proper sense of the word after they gave up the Assembly ; and while until the Revolution they retained a considerable influence upon public affairs, this was extinguished altogether in 1776, when the popular convention at Philadelphia overthrew the colonial system, and set up the new and eccentric state constitution.

The principal theme of the present volume is that well debated question, What did the Quakers do in the Revolutionary War? The discussion of this is usually of a sort calculated to muddy the water rather than develop the truth, but President Sharpless has now made a contribution which will help toward reasonable conclusions. He has availed himself of the records of the Friends' meetings, and has drawn liberally upon the private correspondence of the Pembertons of Philadelphia with their friends in England. The Pemberton brothers, Israel, James and John, were the most conspicuous, and among the most able, of the Pennsylvania Friends, and for thirty years—say 1745 to 1775—they not only stood at the front of the Society, but bore an important part in all public activities. Their letters, cited by President Sharpless, are largely to that distinguished Quaker physician of London, Dr. Samuel Fothergill, though some are to David Barclay, the merchant and banker, grandson of Robert Barclay of Ury, the Quaker “Apologist.” For a considerable time before the fighting actually began Fothergill and Barclay were hard at work in London, with Benjamin Franklin, in an effort to moderate the British demands and calm the American feelings. They had strong hopes for a while that a breach might be avoided. Dr. Fothergill's letter to James Pemberton, January 3, 1775, cited in the present volume, is a fine presentation of the views of an earnest and honest English freeman in that crisis. He says :

“I am afraid they [the ministry] will pursue in one shape or other, the same destructive plan . . . that no abatement of any consequence will be made—no material alterations or concessions. Of course if you are as resolute as we seem, unhappily, to be firm, dissolution must follow. . . . For my own part, having from my early infancy been attentive to America more than many others [and having been acquainted] with some of the most sensible, intelligent, and judicious persons in that country, of every party, denomination, province, and situation, I cannot give up on slight grounds the opinions I have formed of them, of their rights, and of their power likewise. . . . Had our greatest enemies the direction of our counsels they could not drive us to a more dangerous precipice than that to which we seem to be hastening.”

The attitude of the Pennsylvania Friends, from the time when the differences became acute to the end of the Revolution, is easily explained ; the facts are not really an occasion for controversy. The rule of the Friends was that of Peace ; they held, under the teaching of the Head of the Christian church, that wars are unlawful. They were naturally lovers of liberty. Since their first controversies with crown authority and arbitrary rule, represented by Blackwell and Fletcher, three-quarters of a century earlier, they had stood firmly for the rights of popular government. In the pinch of 1765–83 these two principles, opposition to war,

and desire for freedom, had both to be respected. They are, of course, not antagonistic. The plan of the Friends was to support those efforts for the preservation of the popular rights which did not include, or plainly lead up to armed resistance. They therefore joined earnestly in the opposition to the Stamp Act, signed the Non-Importation Agreement, and connived at the repulse and return of the tea ship.

But when the war began they could not maintain an unbroken front. They very soon formed three classes. One, and by far the largest, took no part, and passively resisted all efforts either by the royalists or by the revolutionists to draw them into the fighting. A second class took up arms for the revolt, and the list of names which can be given of these is remarkable, both for size and significance. A third, and by far the smallest class, went with the King, and either took up arms or so far committed themselves that when Howe left Philadelphia in 1778 they did not dare to remain.

President Sharpless estimates that about four hundred Friends were "dealt with" and "disowned" by their meetings for joining the revolutionary army, accepting civil positions under the revolutionary government, or taking an affirmation of allegiance to it. He estimates, also, that "perhaps a score" were similarly dealt with and disowned for active adherence to the royal side. These estimates are entitled to respect, and they show very fairly the relative strength of the active American and "Tory" classes among the Friends—about twenty to one. There are very few names of Pennsylvania Quakers in Sabine's lists of the Loyalists, and all the searching of the records will not develop any considerable number more. The fact is that in the country outside of Philadelphia the sympathies of most Friends were with the revolt, and in the city at least half were on that side. That they were able to maintain their ground—to avoid falling into the royalist movement without sacrificing their testimony for peace—goes to show that they had a greater share of both consistency and tenacity than the average man who approves of Christian doctrine except when applied to a particular war.

As was said of President Sharpless's first volume, the student of Pennsylvania history cannot safely overlook this one. Its citations from original documents, its simplicity of form, its candor of statement, and its judicial temper, unite to give it a special value.

HOWARD M. JENKINS.

*A History of American Privateers.* By EDGAR STANTON MACLAY.  
(New York: D. Appleton and Co. 1899. Pp. xl, 519.)

MR. MACLAY is the author of a *History of the United States Navy* in which he endeavored, successfully, to show that our maritime forces were a most powerful factor in the attainment of American independence. In this new volume he proves that our privateers had even more to do with the establishment of our sea power and with the destruction of English commerce, in both our wars with the mother country, than the vessels